DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 197 783 JC 810 076

AUTHOR Richardson, Richard C.; Leslie, Larry L.
TITLE The Impossible Dream? Financing Community College's Evolving Mission. "Horizons Issues" Monograph Series.
INSTITUTION American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, Washington, D.C.; American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, Washington, D.C. Council of Universities and Colleges.; ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, Los Angeles, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 80
CONTRACT 400-78-0038
NOTE 58p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Role; *Community Colleges; *Educational Finance; *Educational History; *Educational Objectives; Equalization Aid; *Financial Support; Nontraditional Students; State Aid; State Legislation; Tax Allocation; Two Year Colleges; Two Year College Students

ABSTRACT

In response to advocates of an expanded mission for community colleges, this three-part monograph examines the conflict between aspirations for continuing mission development and financial constraints. Part I reviews the development of six aspects of the current community college mission: transfer, vocational, developmental, continuing education, community service, and training and placement programs. It goes on to describe the traditional community college clientele, and the challenge for mission development imposed by an emerging body of non-traditional students made up of unemployed youth, older adults, females, and minorities. Part II examines the inadequacy of existing funding patterns to meet the needs of these students. It includes discussions of: (1) the history of community college financing, revealing the lag between changes in mission and in funding patterns; (2) current sources of financial support and the failure of state funding models to target resources for non-traditional students; (3) the increased use of tuition and fees; and (4) the failure of financial aid programs to meet the needs of non-traditional students. Part III outlines eight recommendations related to: clear articulation of mission, legislative approval of mission statements, program cost determination, program evaluation, alterations in funding and programming, alternative delivery systems, and residence halls. (JP)

THE IMPOSSIBLE DREAM?
FINANCING COMMUNITY COLLEGE'S EVOLVING MISSION

By Richard C. Richardson, Jr., Professor and Chair
Department of Higher and Adult Education
Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona

Larry L. Leslie, Professor and Director
Center for Higher Education
University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona

"Horizons Issues" Monograph Series

American Association of Community and Junior Colleges/
Council of Universities and Colleges/ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges

EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER
ERIC Clearinghouse For Junior Colleges
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES

The material in this publication was prepared pursuant to a contract with the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgement in professional and technical matters. Prior to publication, the manuscript was submitted to the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, Council of Universities and Colleges for critical review and determination of professional competence. This publication has met such standards. Points of view or opinions, however, do not necessarily represent the official view or opinions of the Council of Universities and Colleges or the National Institute of Education.

NIE

This publication was prepared with funding from the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare under contract no. 400-78-0038. The opinions expressed in this report do not necessarily reflect the positions or policies of NIE or HEW.

Price: $5.00

Printed in U.S.A. — August 1980

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Council of Universities and Colleges
"Horizons Issues" Editorial Review Committee

Arthur M. Cohen
Professor of Higher Education
University of California at Los Angeles

INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

The Carnegie Council in its recent report, *Giving Youth a Better Chance: Options for Education, Work and Service*, addresses those youth who do not currently avail themselves of postsecondary opportunities citing the danger of "developing a permanent underclass, a self-perpetuating culture of poverty, a substantial and continuing 'lumpen-proletariat' in the 'home of opportunity where every man is the equal of every other man'." Prominent among the Report's recommendations is the concept that community colleges "should take on a residual responsibility for youth" by adding to its existing missions a "sixth great role."[1]

The Carnegie Council is not alone in its advocacy of an expanded mission for community colleges. Gollattscheck et al. discuss "community renewal colleges" delivering the kind of education community members want and need, and suggest the mission of such institutions should be nothing less than emancipation of all people "from the restrictions of ignorance and socio-economic disadvantage, unemployment, substandard housing, inadequate schooling, poverty, and filth—and emancipation from environmental stagnation and pollution. . . ."[2] K. Patricia Cross in books and speeches has emphasized the need for "education for all" to become "education to each." The American Association of Community and Junior Colleges consistently has advocated the broadest possible interpretation of community college mission in relation to community needs. Walsh identifies community colleges as the most appropriate institutions for developing innovative programs for older adults, handicapped adults, and women reentering the job market.[3]

The purpose of this monograph is to consider whether the community college mission should be expanded and, if so, how the new mission can and should be financed. Part I, in considering the question of mission expansion, reviews the current community college missions in the context of how those missions have evolved. Pointed up here is the fact that the existing community college mission overlaps considerably with what is called for in the "sixth great mission." After each of the six missions is discussed, the traditional community college clienteles are described along with the new clientele that are the focus of this monograph.

Part II, concerning the financing of the new mission, also begins with a treatment of history; but this time attention is drawn to the evolution of the *financing* system. Seen here is a description of how institutional financing of community colleges evolved and how changes in financing have failed to keep pace with changes in mission. Seen also is how low tuition has become inadequate to the task of educating new clientele, who enroll as a result of the new mission, and how student aid evolved as an answer. But student aid, too, is seen to fall short of meeting the needs of the new clientele and for this and other reasons additional strategies are recommended in Part III.

PART I
EVOLVING MISSIONS

When Joliet Junior College was established in 1901, its purpose was clearly defined and easily understood. A need existed to provide the first two years of college for recent high school graduates, who either could not afford to attend a four-year college or university or were not fully prepared academically. This transfer mission persisted as the most significant function of the public junior college and its successor, the community college, until the mid 1960's or early 1970's.

Despite the dominance of the academic transfer function, the history of the first eighty years of the American public junior college is a story of adaptation and evolution as these institutions responded to new clienteles and added the programs required to attract and serve them. Sometimes the motivation has been idealism and philosophical commitment; more often it has been survival and growth. By 1976, the junior college as an upward extension of the public secondary school had evolved, at least in the minds of many of its leaders, into the "community renewal college," which had as its mission no less than the emancipation of "all the people within its community . . . from the restrictions of ignorance and socio-economic disadvantage—unemployment, substandard housing, inadequate schooling, poverty, and filth—and emancipation from environmental stagnation and pollution . . ."[4]

The recent Carnegie Council Report suggests that community colleges should continue the evolutionary process of the past eighty years by assuming, as a sixth great mission or role, a residual responsibility for youth and most particularly for the disadvantaged segment who do not currently avail themselves of postsecondary opportunities. The five accepted roles as defined by the Council include, "(a) academic transfer programs, (b) technical training, (c) terminal general education, (d) community service programs (instruction in nonacademic, nonvocational subjects as requested by members of the community), and (e) community-based programs (such as conferences, cultural events)."[5]

For our purposes, we will alter slightly the five Carnegie roles in order to describe more easily their historical evolution and to identify the intended beneficiaries of each set of services. The roles, as we see them, include, (1) academic transfer programs, (2) vocational-technical education, (3) developmental/remedial programs, (4) continuing education (credit instruction offered at times and locations or through delivery systems that differ from the traditional academic program), (5) community service (into which we combine Carnegie roles d and e) and finally (6) assessment, skill training and placement, which we see as the critical components of the "residual responsibility for youth."

The academic transfer function, as previously noted, was the first to emerge and, as measured by degree credit generation and the number of degrees awarded, remained for more than seventy years the most important function of the two-year college. In 1970, the first year for which separate figures are available, transfer associate degrees accounted for 144,000 or 57.3 percent of the 253,000 two-year degrees awarded.[6] By 1975–76 transfer associate degrees, while increasing in number to 175,000, had declined as a percentage of the total to 44.8 of the 390,000 associate degrees awarded.

The vocational education function was introduced into the community college following passage of the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917.[7] Development of this function, however, grew at a slow pace until the Vocational Education Act of 1963 because Smith-Hughes language had stated that eligibility could not be extended to college level programs.[8] In 1922, the American Association of Junior Colleges had defined their member colleges as "institutions offering two years of instruction of strictly college grade."[9] The result was that vocational-technical programs truly responsive to the needs of potential students were severely lacking. As late as 1956, *The Fifty-Fifth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education* reported from a survey of 560 junior colleges that only 18 percent offered any vocational programs other than secretarial and general business. Of interest to the discussion of the three other modern community college missions, the same volume, published as a comprehensive treatment of the public junior college of that era, contains no reference to remedial or developmental education or for that matter, to any additional function beyond a limited treatment of community service.[10]

Yet, only 19 years later, career related programs had displaced transfer as the primary objective of a majority of students attending.[11] Current estimates of the relative numbers of transfer and vocational students are complicated by several factors. First, because of student interest and funding incentives, an increasingly broad array of vocational-technical programs and courses seek shelter under the "career program" umbrella. Second, old labels no longer are mutually exclusive. Many career programs are no longer terminal and whether a student transfers to a four-year institution often is more a matter of individual choice than of the student's community college program. All-in-all, it seems clear that the function of providing education for entry into employment has achieved equal status with the earlier transfer function, at least in terms of student interests and enrollments.

The developmental/remedial function is a more recent stage in the evolution of community college missions, a stage probably related directly to the open-door philosophy. In Medsker's landmark volume of 1960, there are five pages devoted to a description of the remedial function. Medsker found that three-fourths of the colleges in his study made some provision for the 16 percent of the students who gave evidence on a standardized examination of having aptitude below that customarily regarded as necessary for a regular baccalaureate degree.[12]

Monroe described the one-year curriculum initiated in 1959 at Wilson College (now Kennedy-King) as one of the first such programs to be offered anywhere in the nation. He also identified problems faced by many urban community colleges in the early sixties when median scores for entering freshmen dropped to the lowest level of any collegiate institutional section and fifty percent of entering freshmen were lost, either voluntarily or not, by the end of the first semester.[13]

Community colleges have enrolled increasingly higher percentages of students who require programs and services beyond those endogenous to the transfer and career programs previously available. Simultaneously, there has occurred a broadening of the scope of deficiencies observed, partially because institutions are ever seeking new clientele. The illiterate and the near-illiterate, those who cannot speak or write English, convicts and the physically handicapped, have joined the late bloomers and the mildly remedial of an earlier decade.

Acceptance and advancement of the remedial function have not been marked by the same progress characteristic of career programs. The decision to initiate remedial programs was controversial in many colleges and was achieved only because it was easier than answering public questions about dropout rates or trying to teach college level courses to heterogeneous classes in which many could not read or write. Advancement of the remedial function has been hindered by difficulty in evaluating outcomes. Roueche and Snow criticized the absence of outcome data from earlier studies, but ultimately were required in their own survey to rely upon the self-estimates of colleges responding. Not surprisingly, a majority of the institutions "reported that their programs were successful."[14] A second hindrance emanates from the financial need of a majority of these students and from financial aid regulations. In order to qualify for significant financial assistance, students must be scheduled for twelve credit hours of work each semester. Further, such work must apply to a degree. The result is that institutions are forced either to enroll remedial students in regular college courses where their lack of literacy skills dooms them to failure or to establish special courses. These special courses often do not articulate with transfer or vocational-technical offerings and frequently impose time and format constraints inconsistent with the learning styles and needs of those who enroll. Finally, there is the matter of standards and effects on the integrity of the institution: the college must award credits for work that clearly is below college level. The situation becomes so distorted that sometimes the only measurable achievement for a semester's work is raising reading skills from a third to a fourth grade level.

The continuing education function, so labeled because it is the term most commonly used in community colleges, nevertheless has varying meanings. On the one extreme, the term may be used to describe academic transfer courses offered in the evening. On the other, it may encompass all of the non-credit courses and activities, which also may be labeled community services or community education.[15] We use the term here to encompass those courses community colleges offer for degree credit in either the academic transfer or the vocational-technical programs at locations away from the college campus, or such programs offered through alternative delivery systems designed to improve access, or such programs offered at times different from those acceptable to full-time day students.

The list of continuing education variations is extensive and growing. Credit courses are offered at such locations as business offices, industrial plants, correctional institutions, churches, public schools, shopping centers and military installations. Alternative delivery systems include the mails, television, telephone and radio. Time schedules range from the traditional evening or extended day programs through mini-semesters and weekend colleges. The various combinations of location, delivery system, and time are limited only by the imagination of the college and the receptivity of the clientele.

Although continuing education probably had its origin in the 1920's in the evening school offered for adults, growth was slow until the 1950's.[16] The enrollment of continuing education students stood at only about 21,000 in 1936, but was more than 400,000 in 1957. In one (1959) sample of 158 public junior colleges 88 percent offered programs of service to adults.[17] By 1965, part-time community college enrollments (not the same as our definition of continuing education but probably the closest for which data are available) totalled over 580,000 and represented slightly more than half of all community college enrollments.[18]

Continuing education, as defined herein, has been responsible for virtually all of the growth in credit hour generation recorded by community colleges since 1972. The golden era of growth in full-time enrollments came abruptly to an end in 1971 and 1972, when total enrollments actually declined, stunning college administrators and causing discussions of reductions in force.

The downturn in enrollment has led to the use of marketing techniques to attract students and has resulted in many of the innovations in locations, delivery systems and time previously noted.[19] The outcome has been noted in the most recent enrollment data. From 1976–1978, full-time enrollment in two-year colleges decreased from 1.75 million to 1.61 million; part-time enrollment increased from 2.33 million to 2.53 million.[20] A concomitant change, with important implications for finance, has been the increased use of visiting or adjunct faculty paid at part-time rates.

The community service function was described in considerable detail by Harlacher who listed four major objectives: encouraging use of college facilities and services by community groups; using skills and knowledge of staff and other experts to provide need-based educational services for all age groups; providing leadership and coordination to assist in long-range planning for the community and in attacking unsolved problems; and contributing to cultural, intellectual, social and leisure time opportunities for the community.[21] Harlacher appears to include in his discussion of community services all degree credit activity which occurs off-campus, as well as all non-credit courses and college-community interaction of the non-course variety. Obviously, there is overlap with our definition of continuing education.

Attempts to differentiate between continuing education and community services encounter one of the same problems previously described for the academic transfer versus vocational-technical dichotomy. The problem concerns the "fluidity" of what is a credit experience. Most states have specifically excluded non-credit courses and activities from state reimbursement. One response has been for community colleges to offer credit for everything imaginable.

Respectability and legitimacy may be lost. In the late sixties and early seventies, the Pennsylvania formula provided for a conversion ratio through which contact hours in non-credit courses were equated to credit hours by dividing by thirty. Cited by legislators in terminating this reimbursement was the practice of some colleges of counting attendance at concerts and multiplying by the number of hours the event lasted and the installation of a counter on the library turnstile. The procedure was then to multiply the daily count by the average number of hours estimated for those using the library. Nevertheless, differentiating community service from continuing education on the basis of whether credit is granted is a useful distinction for analyzing funding patterns and issues.

Although definitional problems abound, it is nonetheless possible to establish some estimates of the magnitude and growth of non-credit activity. There is no standard definition of the minimum or maximum duration of experiences that constitutes "community education enrollments" as participation in non-credit service, recreational, and life enrichment academic programs as titled by AACJC. Further, there are maintained no student records of the sort that are required for degree credit students and, thus, no method of determining unduplicated headcount. Community education enrollments for 1975–76, the first year they were estimated on a July 1 to June 30 basis, are said to have totalled 3.26 million.[22] In 1977, community education enrollment was 2.85 million and in 1978, 3.08 million. Although some institutions do not routinely collect this information and the field was frequently left blank on the survey forms,[23] it is clear that a very large number of people participate in community services and that the numbers seem to be holding fairly constant.

The practice in the literature of including continuing education (usually termed adult education) under the community service rubric precludes any attempt to trace the origins and historic growth of the latter function. It is apparent, however, from Reynolds' 1955 discussion that the concept of community service was well developed by the 1950's and was accepted as a normal function of the junior college.[24] Monroe believes that the function can be traced to the 1920's and the birthdate of the adult education movement.[25]

Because of state funding formulae, however, it seems clear that experiences otherwise qualifying as community services are being converted to credit activities. In addition, the growing evening program of credit offerings for part-time students at many colleges has pre-empted the space available for the lower priority non-credit activities. The practice of giving priority to credit courses, which qualify for state reimbursement, may account for the decline in community education enrollments previously noted.

An interesting digression concerns the growing number of community college districts that are establishing colleges-without-walls in answer to the shortage of space for community service, as well as for continuing education. Initially, the concept was used, probably by necessity, by such institutions as Austin Community College in Texas, Whatcom Community College in Washington and the Vermont Community College System.[26] Now there is a trend for large multicampus districts such as Peralta and Coast in California and Maricopa in Arizona to establish such institutions, partly as a response to the space crunch and partly to deal with territoriality issues within the established traditional colleges of the districts.

In their most recent manifestation, colleges-without-walls are almost exclusively continuing education and community service institutions, offering courses rather than programs. Most of their full-time staff are administrators who recruit and supervise far-flung legions of part-time faculty. They market aggressively, giving primary attention to credit offerings that generate state support. They lack the resources and continuity, for the most part, to offer vocational-technical programs (as distinct from discrete courses) or remedial services; they make extensive use of media and alternative delivery systems. Colleges-without-walls can be traced at least to the City Colleges of Chicago television college established in 1956.

The preceding review of mission evolution and institutional adaptation leaves the observer with a lingering doubt whether any sort of discrete "sixth great mission" remains to be served. Notwithstanding the great prestige of the Carnegie Council, one is left to wonder whether anyone can describe a viable community college function that some community college somewhere is not already serving. Certainly the inhibitions are few. A case can be made that the open-door philosophy of the junior college removes the formal admission obstacle. Evening courses, remedial programs, comprehensive curricula, and extensive guidance services would seem to be essential ingredients of an institutional response. More recent emphasis upon recruiting and outreach efforts have moved community colleges further toward the mission advocated by the Carnegie Council.

Yet, the great mass of the Carnegie Council's "underserved youth" remains and there are identifiable reasons why community colleges have not fully met the need. For example, attempts to provide services to the estimated 23 million functionally illiterate American adults have run into serious problems when these services have been integrated into regular college programs.[27] The concept of extending academic credit for basic literacy and vocational skill training offends academic faculty who make no pretense of concealing their scorn for those who take these courses or those who teach them. Degree credit students quick to adopt the values of their faculty mentors, disparage the trainees and their programs adding to the trainees' pre-existing doubts about self-worth. Teaching loads designed around the demands of the academic transfer program and the capabilities of the students who enroll in them are ill-suited to the needs of the basic skill trainee. If faculty union contracts are extended to those who teach in skills programs, costs become prohibitive.

COMMUNITY COLLEGE CLIENTELES: THE OLD AND THE NEW

The role and mission of the community college has undergone substantial evolution and expansion in the years that have passed since the founding of Joliet Junior College. In particular, the last two decades have brought enormous changes in numbers and diversity. Now the Carnegie Council has urged the further expansion to the historically most difficult to serve segments of the American population. The evolution of functions from transfer education through vocational-technical programs, remedial services and continuing education, has already brought important changes in clientele including more part-time students, a broader range of educational and physical disabilities, more minorities including a growing number for whom English is a second language, more older Americans and many others.

Increased access and broadened mission largely have taken place within national and state funding policies, which have given priority to the full-time, 18–23 year old student. The rapid expansion of opportunities for residential study in four-year colleges and universities, state planning documents for the development of community colleges, and the development of state and federal student aid programs, all attest to the priority that has been given to increasing access and choice for the traditional college-age student.

The success of these programs is evident. The total number of students enrolled in postsecondary education, the increasing percentage of low-income and minority students in attendance, and the number and characteristics of students enrolled in independent institutions indicate that the needs of this segment may largely have been met.

For several reasons, postsecondary institutions traditionally have focused on the full-time, 18–23 year olds as a clientele and on the programs, faculties, and facilities designed to serve them. Parents wanted their children to have educational opportunities and the accompanying upward occupational mobility they themselves were denied. The increasingly technological nature of work and general changes in the labor market made collegiate preparation a viable background for entering the work force. All of these factors and others resulted in the priority accorded the 18–23 year old in access to postsecondary education.

However, educational institutions, like other users of labor and capital, are subject to the law of diminishing returns. Evidence of diminishing returns to investment in postsecondary education opportunity for the traditional 18–23 year old can be found among the following:

1. There currently exists an imbalance between the number of graduates and the opportunities for employment in a significant number of fields. The imbalance is most publicized in liberal arts and education. The shift of students away from these programs has created some surplus capacity in terms of facilities and faculty.
2. Nationally, college attendance rates have declined, particularly among white, male, middle-income students.
3. Competition for the 18–23 year old has become intense, leading to substantial expenditures for recruiting and advertising, and resulting in lowered admission standards.
4. Postsecondary institutions have been more successful in attracting students than in retaining them. Forty percent of entering college freshmen either drop out or shift colleges. The failure rate is 80 to 90 percent for the most disadvantaged, educationally.[28]
5. Changing admission standards increase the number of high risk students enrolled but corresponding initiatives to assure their academic success are severely lacking. Depending on the institution entered, a student with deficiencies might be enrolled in a series of remedial courses, a special assistance program or be left to sink or swim in a regular classroom. Research indicates that disadvantaged individuals are unlikely to be able to make appropriate choices among available alternatives.[29]

These examples are not to suggest that access and choice for the full-time, 18–23 year old student are unimportant or that there is not a continuing need to serve this group effectively. Given the credentialing function of postsecondary education, it will always be essential to ensure preservation of access and choice. To relinquish the advances would return to a system of discrimination now being eliminated at considerable public expense.

It does no disservice to the achievements of the past fifteen years, however, to question whether the attention accorded the 18–23 year old inhibits addressing the legitimate needs of other groups of citizens—groups for whom the return for the public dollar invested might be substantially greater.

There is a considerable body of literature regarding the nature and the needs of nontraditional students. There is also evidence that ". . . nontraditional students—women, ethnic or racial minorities, and older students not entering a postsecondary institution upon graduation from high school . . . do not respond to cost considerations and institutional options in the same way as conventional students."[30] Studies of the characteristics of adults who avail themselves of adult education opportunities indicate that as a group they tend to be above average both in terms of income and previous formal education.[31] Such studies have been used as the basis for two commonly held assumptions: (1) adult education has not been successful in reaching disadvantaged adult populations, and (2) those who desire adult education are capable of paying for it themselves.

Evidence of the widespread influence of these assumptions may be found both in the literature and in practice. "Most colleges and universities are still unwilling to place the training of adults in the teaching basket where it belongs. Rather they toss it into the catchall public service function—along with such important but academically low priority activities as fund raising and alumni, legislative and community relations. In budgetary terms this means unsatisfactory financing in the best of times, the axe in tight periods."[32]

It should not be surprising that those who have the highest incomes are the most likely to take advantage of educational services, the costs of which must be borne entirely by a "tax" on the user. Those who live on fixed incomes or whose income levels fall near the poverty level may be priced out of the opportunity to participate by any charge. As user charges increase, the number of nontraditional students who can afford to participate declines correspondingly. A recognition of this phenomenon has led to programs for the support of degree credit students who can attend at least half-time. Those whose objectives do not include earning a degree or whose job and family responsibilities preclude attendance at the minimum half-time level have experienced rising prices fueled at least in part by the availability of student aid for traditional students—aid which has reduced politically, general price increase resistance. Indeed, our best estimate is that approximately one-third of student aid translates directly into tuition increases.[33]

THE NEW CLIENTELE: WHO ARE THEY?

The new clientele for evolving community college missions comes from all age and income groups, all racial and ethnic groups, and all regional and employment sectors. Nevertheless, they are targeted best by focusing on, in addition to the underserved youth, older, female, and minority individuals.

In 1975 about 23 million, or slightly over 10 percent of the population, were 65 or older. Conservative estimates indicate the numbers will reach 30 million by the year 2000.[34] This large group of senior citizens has in many regards been treated inequitably by the postsecondary system. All of those who will reach senior status by the year 2000 grew up during an era when access to postsecondary education was limited. Yet it was this group more than any other that made possible the enormous expansion of educational opportunity enjoyed by later generations. Now, and in the future, this older-age group will be interested in partaking of some of the postsecondary opportunities they helped to create. But a different set of funding rules will face them. Few among these seniors are interested in enrolling in degree programs for which there are public subsidies; rather, their interest is in non-degree programs that are largely self-supporting.

According to census data, 1 in 6 white males and 1 in 5 black males facing compulsory retirement are not eligible for retirement benefits. Of those who are eligible 3 of 10 have only plans they have set up for themselves.[35] The tendency for older citizens, who can afford to do so, to migrate to the sun belt has been widely noted. Where concentrations of senior citizens have developed in such locations as St. Petersburg, Florida, and Phoenix, Arizona, very extensive programs of adult education can be found. These concentrations of senior citizens are economic boons to their communities. They bring bank accounts, do not require much in the way of public services, and, notwithstanding the octogenarian trio in "Going in Style," they have low crime rates.

It is, of course, the more affluent senior citizens who take advantage of warmer climates, and it is this same group who utilizes adult education because they can afford to do so. The less affluent ones, who have little or no discretionary income to spend on either travel or education, are often condemned to a post-retirement existence that offers little in the way of stimulation or human interaction.

Information is available on the needs of the senior population. Retirement planning, including such areas as income and financial management, health, housing options, legal services and use of social services, is one important area. Enrichment, including handicraft and hobby activities, also ranks high. For seniors, painting, jewelry making, macrame, and similar activities become an important adaptive response to the physical restrictions of advancing age as well as a small but important source of income for a limited number. For a smaller number of seniors, second careers or volunteer service activities may be important outcomes of postsecondary education.

Seniors are not the only group who are treated inequitably by current public policy in the funding of postsecondary education. Until very recently, women participated in higher education at a much lower rate than men. As a consequence, there are large numbers of undereducated women in the 25–55 age range. Yet, the need is great. The percentage of families headed by women increased from 9.4 in 1950 to 13 percent in 1975. The number of two worker families went from 1 in 3 to 1 in 2 during the same time period. The average work-life expectancy for women has increased from 15 to 23 years.[36]

Women experience numerous deprivations and obstacles to self-betterment. Among minorities, women head 35 percent of black families; average median incomes of these families are only $4,898. For Hispanic families the comparable figures are 20 percent and $4,785. Since the present system of financial aid favors full-time students, many women, who have jobs and families and cannot enroll even half-time, are excluded from eligibility. Further, more strict aid regulations for independent students penalize married women. In sum, women receive less assistance than men because their patterns of attendance are different and they are more likely to have sole family responsibility.[37]

Other statistics suggest the existence of additional underserved segments and newly developing educational needs. Sixty-four percent of 45–54 year old Hispanic origin persons have not completed high school, compared to thirty-four percent for the total 45 million adults in this age range. New postsecondary needs are illustrated by the fact that each year 8.7 percent of the population actually changes occupations, while 36 percent describe themselves as being in some state of occupational transition.[38] For most if not all of these groups, half-time (or more) attendance in a program leading to a baccalaureate degree seems neither feasible nor desirable.

Institutional interests in increasing the college attendance rate of full-time students, combined with an historic focus on the 18–23 year old population, have resulted in patterns of funding mitigating against postsecondary attendance by part-time students, older citizens, employed women, and the geographically immobile. The central issue is whether the few additional public dollars available in the near future will be spent to entice greater numbers of recent high school graduates or to expand opportunities and services for the millions of nontraditional students who might benefit from them.

Critical disjunctions have developed between the needs of a growing nontraditional clientele, growth oriented funding formulas that are based upon enrollments of full-time students, and state and national need-based individual assistance programs. The next section of this monograph traces the historical development of community college finance and examines the present funding of students and programs, focusing on the incongruencies between an evolving community college mission and existing financial arrangements.

PART II
SHORTCOMINGS IN PRESENT FUNDING MODES

In Part II of this monograph we examine the present funding of the community college student who is our focus and of the programs designed to meet their needs. We begin by tracing the historical development of community college finance, reasoning that one can better understand the inadequacies of present financing structures through the perspectives of the past. With the stage set, we then examine the present funding of students and programs, focusing on the incongruencies of the new community college mission and the existing financial structure. In the final section we reflect upon how the structure should be changed to meet the present and future challenges.

COMMUNITY COLLEGE FINANCE EVOLVING

Students of higher education quickly learn that history and tradition are the major forces shaping the enterprise. Things are the way they are "because they have always been that way." The historical roots of higher education phenomena account in large measure for the state in which those phenomena exist today—even though the present state often may not make much rational sense. Contemporary conditions may differ dramatically from the conditions prevailing at the time the phenomena originated.

The financing of community colleges in America is no exception. Contemporary financing strategies are more vestiges of a bygone era than they are reflections of present conditions. Modern community college missions vary greatly from those of earlier days but financing strategies have not changed accordingly. Instead, these strategies have lagged behind, often as much as a decade or two or even more. It is worth observing how this incongruency of missions and financing modes has evolved.

Garms traces the precedence of the community college to 1839 and Horace Mann's normal school, which was an extension of the secondary school.[39] Although by no means the prototype of the modern community college, the normal school established the precedent of a postsecondary institution of only two years duration and lying organizationally between the secondary school and the university. Although the normal school evolved not into the community college but into the teachers' college, then into the state college, and finally often into a state university, the idea of a two-year institution was firmly established.

The commonly recognized antecedent of the community college was conceived by Tappan of Michigan (1852) and was reinforced by Folwell of Minnesota in his 1869 inaugural address. This antecedent, which was indeed the prototype of the modern community college, was rather than an extension of secondary education a "lower extremity amputation." Tappan suggested that secondary schools provide two more years of secondary education so that the universities could become "purely universities" and not engage, as he viewed them as doing, in the "lower education" of the first two years of university education. Though apparently not in response to Tappan, Lasell Junior College in Massachusetts did offer the first two years of collegiate instruction in 1852.[40]

It was not until 1892 that Tappan's words were directly heeded. In that year Harper designated the first two years at the University of Chicago as "Academic College" and the last two years as "University College." Only four years later the former was redesignated a "junior college"—a name that dominated the movement until at least 1939. Harper also was instrumental in the establishment of Joliet Junior College in 1901, when two years were added to the high school curriculum as advocated half a century earlier by Tappan. Joliet often is considered to be the oldest, surviving community college.

The significance of these early years to this financial treatise is in the organizational roots and early mission of the community—or as it was known then—the junior college. As noted, early junior colleges organizationally were not "colleges" at all—with the exception of Chicago—but rather were secondary schools. As extensions of secondary schools, they were financed primarily by the local school districts, with some state support. They were not given state appropriations, per se, as were public colleges but instead gained their nourishment from their parent school districts. This is clearly seen in California where the early junior colleges, such as Fresno (1910), Santa Barbara (1911) and Los Angeles (1912), were organized under local school boards.

The general pattern of support of local schools in the early 1900's consisted of a local property tax supplemented by a flat grant per student or per classroom.[41] Thus, it is correct to state that the early support of junior colleges, too, was from local property taxes and undifferentiated, flat, per student grants. In 1934, local districts provided 84.3 percent of the income of the colleges they supported. Student fees accounted for most of the remainder. By 1950, local district support had declined to 48.8 percent, student fees had dropped to 8.9 percent and federal payments for veterans accounted for 13.5 percent. The difference in 1950 was made up by state funds which amouted to 25.5 percent of the total.[42]

This financial pattern, of course, made a considerable amount of sense. Junior college students were, after all, engaged primarily in a continuation of the high school academic curriculum. Certainly, there was no or extremely little vocational education or any of the special programs and students populating community colleges today. All were oriented toward the first two years of a traditional college education.

The state interest in two-year colleges dates from the post World War II period and was fueled by the impact of mushrooming school enrollments on the local property tax rate. After 1950, many states enacted legislation for public community colleges and gave them support. In return for a modest loss in local autonomy, district boards received compensation which averaged less than 20 percent of operating costs.[43] The pattern of mission evolution followed by growing strains on sources of financial support followed by modest adjustments in state funding arrangements has been a recurring cycle in the history of community college development. Such institutions have been low cost, not because it has been inexpensive to undertake the functions they have assessed or been assigned, but rather because they have not been able to command the necessary level of support.[44]

During the 1950's and early 60's, a second important trend in community college financing emerged. Under the influence of state master plans, junior colleges became independent community college districts with their own boards and taxing authority. By 1970, independent districts had been approved in twenty-five states. The unified public school district operating a community college had virtually become extinct.[45]

Achievement of separate taxing authority, growth in state support, increased federal funds, and, above all, an ever-increasing stream of students resulting in per capita reimbursements contributed to a period of relative affluence in the 50's and 60's. In comparison with previous decades, it was a golden era. During the period from 1961–1968, state support increased from 26 to 36 percent while local support declined from 40 percent to 30 percent. Tuition remained at a modest 13 percent for public two-year colleges.[46]

The decade of the sixties also brought rapid expansion in mission with only modest changes in funding arrangements. The principle of providing an added increment of funding for vocational-technical offerings was established in many states, but seldom did the negotiated increments cover the actual costs of the more expensive programs. Other developments were less favorable. In Illinois, in attempting to get the votes necessary for community college district formation operating levy limits were established that were unrealistically low. In states such as Texas and Michigan districts were established and boards elected; but the authority to levy a local tax was defeated in the same elections. In Maryland, Pennsylvania and New Jersey community college boards did not have taxing authority. They could only recommend a local levy to school boards or county authorities, who had the power to approve or reject the request.

As state support for community colleges increased, state controls also increased. The trend toward increased state coordination of postsecondary education has been widely reported. For community colleges with their history of local control, the development has not infrequently resulted in conflict between local authorities and state government.

The third major trend in community college financing, total state support, is one response to this problem. In 1954–55, Utah was the only state in which junior colleges were totally supported by state funds—leaving aside Georgia and Louisiana where the two-year colleges were an integral part of the university system.[47] By 1975, seventeen states received no income from local revenues while an additional twelve received less than 10 percent.[48] Although the independent community college district with its own taxing authority remains the preferred form of organization among professionals associated with the community college movement, the experience in Florida, where local contributions were terminated without loss of local initiative suggests that state funding can occur without sacrificing the community oriented mission.

Regardless of the source of funding, the seventies have been largely a story of mission expansion eroding the surpluses of the sixties and turning them into deficits. A lower priority for all postsecondary education, resistance to increased property taxes, increasingly antiquated funding formulas and runaway inflation are all contributing factors. Analysis by the Illinois Community College Board indicated that in terms of constant dollars, unit expenditures for instruction in community colleges were 42 percent less in 1977 than in 1971. An unpublished study for the Pennsylvania Community College Presidents Council by S.V. Martorana indicated full-time student equivalent constant dollar expenditures in 1971–72 of $1,092 compared with $1,013 in 1977. During that same period when average operating costs in current dollars increased by $708 per full-time equivalent, state support increased by $100. Between 1972 and 1978, Maryland state funding per full-time equivalent increased by 14 percent while the inflation rate for institutions of higher education was 49 percent.[49]

Over the decades, the original missions of the community college have expanded and new missions have been added. New functions have sometimes meant modest or occasionally even major funding alterations but the original character of community college finance remained intact. The emergence of universal higher education added millions of those previously excluded from postsecondary education: the lower income, the minorities, the women, the handicapped, and concomitantly, the poorly prepared. But, old funding schemes were expected to carry the lion's share of the financial burden. The situation was depicted thusly by Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr. in 1979 testimony before the Committee on Labor and Human Resources of the United States Senate:

> Funding arrangements often appear to be based upon the community college of fifteen years ago rather than today or tomorrow. Clearly enrollment driven formulas have serious deficiencies . . . when a greater proportion of the students are there on a part-time basis. And this is a trend that continues—more part-time students—students for whom education is concurrent with work—family and citizenship responsibilities.[50]

CURRENT SUPPORT OF INSTITUTIONS

Institutional support of community colleges is in a word—diverse. The primary reference, Wattenbarger and Stepp's biennial state financing survey for the National Council of State Directors of Community/Junior Colleges (NCSDCJC), lists data for 36 states in the 1978 edition.[51] These states, plus two others responding, enroll over 95 percent of all U.S. community college students. The data show that all 36 states provide some operating funds for community colleges but that the extent of support ranges broadly: from 22.5 percent of operating budgets in Wisconsin to 95 percent in Massachusetts. Local funds are contributed in 26 states but are of major consequence (more than 10 percent of operating budgets) in only 19 states. Only 8 states receive more than 10 percent of their operating funds from federal sources. Tuition is becoming increasingly important in financing community colleges, with 29 of the 36 states now indicating that tuition composes more than 10 percent of operating budgets. By operating fund category, following are the average percentage figures for 35 states.[52]

Average Percent of 1977-78 Community College Operating Funds by Source

State	Local	Federal	Tuition	Other	Total
59	15	5	18	3	100

Clearly, community colleges are supported overwhelmingly from state sources with tuition and local funds providing roughly equal shares. Federal and "other" support account for the smallest shares, about 8 percent totally.

In way of background, certain other financial facts are worth noting. For example, average expenditures per FTE student vary by a factor of more than 2.5: 1 in the 33 states for which comparable data are available, being $1,010 per FTE in South Carolina as contrasted with $2,634 in Wisconsin. Local property taxes as a percentage of tax support of community colleges range from zero in 10 states to 52 percent in Arizona.

There has been considerable discussion about the merits and disadvantages of funding postsecondary institutions through use of local property taxes. Proponents have generally stressed the advantages of local autonomy, while opponents have noted the regressive nature of local property taxes and the inequities which result from variations in the property tax base. The issue has been given renewed attention since the passage of Proposition 13 in California, a state which relies heavily on the property tax to finance community colleges. California ranked at the top of the 20 states surveyed in 1975 with 42.9 percent of current fund revenues coming from the local district. Needless to say, California has lost its ranking. Excluding Wisconsin, which does not operate a system of comprehensive community colleges, Illinois and New York now compete for first place in reliance on the local property tax to finance community colleges.

A recent analysis of the effects of reliance on the local property tax in Illinois reached the following conclusions:[53]

1. In 1975-76 equalized property wealth per FTE student ranged from $91,993 to $650,707.
2. Total district revenues ranged from $893 per FTE student to $2,302.
3. Revenues from local district sources excluding tuition and fees ranged from $193 to $1,256 per FTE student.

4. There was a direct relationship between property wealth and total revenues.
5. Districts with high property values tended to charge higher tuitions (reflecting perhaps the ability of their residents to pay such tuitions).
6. Using several measures of fiscal equity, greater equity was achieved in 1974 than 1977 despite state affects at equalization largely because of the increasing share of total revenues coming from tuition and fees.
7. A majority of the districts were spending below permissible levels.

The tuition and fee range per semester hour in Illinois for Fall 1979 was $4.22 to $21. The ability to pay differs significantly among Illinois community college districts, with the per capital income in 1974 ranging from $3419 in Shawnee to $7920 in Oakton. In 1979, Shawnee was next to lowest in tuition charged while Oakton was slightly above the median. In general, the districts with least wealth, charge the lowest tuition; but the ability of a district to follow such a policy is limited by state law which establishes a local property tax ceiling, subject to change only through local referenda. Since 1973, initiatives have been defeated 20 times and passed 6.[54]

In states where community colleges derive significant revenues from a local property tax, the local property owner may support federal aid to individuals, a state student aid program, extensive subsidies to public institutions outside his/her geographic limits and, finally, an increasing percentage of the total costs of operating a local college. Additionally, the local property owner responsible for supporting this extensive system may pay a user tax in the form of increasingly higher tuition to take advantage of the local college. The taxes are paid in part to support more than enough space to accommodate those who want to seek a bachelor's degree as a full-time student at public four-year institutions where total costs other than tuition are borne by the state. Low income is no barrier to attendance since the lower the income the more aid is available. Even the absence of academic preparation is no problem as institutions that need students develop special assistance programs to accommodate them.

Augenblick summarizes the three major problems related to the local property tax:

1. State aid is distributed with only limited consideration for the ability of local districts to generate their share of support. Even in states such as Illinois where some effort

has been made toward equalization, the result may be disequalizing because of the ability of wealthier districts to raise tuition and fees without penalizing their residents.

2. Because tuition charges vary among institutions, students who desire to take the same courses may have to pay radically different charges. There is no rational reason for permitting a district's wealth to determine the tuition paid by students.

3. Because subsidies to community colleges are not coordinated with subsidies to other postsecondary institutions, students enrolled in community colleges in courses similar to those in other types of institutions may not benefit from the same expenditure levels. This situation creates inequities in the distribution both of costs and educational benefits. (For example, community college students are much more likely to be taught by a part-time instructor due to the level of subsidy their institutions receive for courses that may be directly transferable to other institutions.)[55]

All this is in the way of background. How then, if at all, are the targeted programs, and indirectly, targeted students financed?

Wattenbarger and Stepp identify four state funding models.[56] Three of these four, on the face of it, do not target any resources on the programs and students under study.

According to Wattenbarger and Stepp, the "negotiated budget" approach is utilized in 11 states plus the state operated Colorado community colleges. In this funding approach state appropriations are negotiated annually (or biennially). Presumably, institutions or their spokespersons in state governing and coordinating structures are availed of opportunity to seek additional funds for special programs and students, and no doubt some successes are noted here. However, it is a well known fact that budgets tend to be incremental;[57] that is, they are based less on rational arguments for new programs than on the simple premise that government agencies should receive the amount appropriated last year plus a little more for such eventualities as inflation. Thus, in actual practice it is likely under the negotiated budget approach that money targeted on special needs will be money taken from other budget categories. In the final analysis most appropriations gains, at the margin, fail to alleviate the problems of financing special programs and students. Further, the 11 states that utilize the negotiated budget approach are relatively minor players in the national community college scene.

The second financing model is the "unit rate formula", utilized in 16 states (including the "district" colleges in Colorado) of which several are "major" community college states. State allocations are made on a dollar per unit of output basis (e.g., FTE's, SCH's) and generally are not differentiated for varying kinds of students or programs.

Third is the "minimum foundation" model, which is a modification of the unit rate formula approach. Here, state allocations are netted out for a local tax yield. The intent is to equalize state funding, taking into account differences in local wealth. This model does very little, if anything to provide for differentiated program or student funding. Seven states, three of which have large community college systems, employ this model.

The fourth model potentially does allow for targeted program and student funding. This model, the "cost based program funding" model, involves state allocations based upon actual expenditures in cost centers. Depending upon the level of aggregation of the cost centers, this approach may take into account actual expenditures in various programs. However, because the level of aggregation of the cost centers varies tremendously by state, the extent of targeted funding ranges widely. Further, these formulas invariably are based upon historic costs. Therefore, the amounts allocated annually per cost center and ultimately to targeted programs are a function of how much was spent in the past. As already seen, the history of targeted support for programs serving new clientele is not very positive. Our knowledge of institutional internal resource allocation procedures suggests that the programs and students under study here fail to receive adequate or equitable funding. Sixteen states, including four major community college systems fall into this category of cost based program funding.

A closer examination of current changes occurring in the targeting of resources on students and programs is available from Martorana and Smutz's annual survey—again with the support of NCSDCJC—of *State Legislation Affecting Community and Junior Colleges*.[58] In the 1978 report Martorana and Smutz noted a rising legislative concentration upon financial concerns. Of 205 financially-oriented statutes enacted or proposed a small but significant number related to the questions under study here. For example, the Michigan legislature passed (but the Governor vetoed) a bill providing special support for such services as remedial education and counseling.[59] Another valiant though futile effort was noted in Arizona, where the legislature defeated an attempt to fund non-credit courses for senior citizens.[60]

Successes, on the other hand, were noted in Minnesota, which appropriated $65,000 for a statewide career guidance program;[61] in California and Mississippi, which passed special enactments for medical programs in community colleges;[62] in Ohio, which made a supplemental appropriation of $50,000 for community college technical equipment;[63] in Kansas, which allowed community college boards to invoke special taxes for adult basic education;[64] and in New Mexico, which allowed for tuition reduction or elimination for certain vocational courses.[65]

Acting in the opposite direction, California limited the types of non-credit courses that can be state subsidized.[66] Similarly, South Carolina now precludes state assistance to community colleges for senior citizens attending on tuition waivers;[67] and Nebraska now requires non-degree and recreation courses to be self-supporting.[68]

In their 1979 report, Martorana and Smutz offer a new perspective.[69] Observing that almost half (44.6%) of all financial legislation affecting community colleges was designed for state government in general and another 16.8 percent was designed for higher education in general, the authors questioned the extent to which the unique needs of community colleges are being met. There is little doubt, from reports such as this, that community college institutional support maintains a kind of undifferentiated, monolithic tenor, even into the 1980's.

In sum, there is evidence of some effort to target finances on the programs and students under study here. However, as regards institutional funding, it appears that most efforts at least at the state level fail to take programs and student differences into account. This is not to say that current block-type funding schemes preclude these special programs and students but rather that the funds provided permit a support core or base, without recognizing the costly aspects of special endeavors.

THE HISTORIC PRACTICE OF LOW OR NO TUITION

Until the 1970's it was widely held that the best way to provide postsecondary opportunities for students was to maintain adequate institutional support so that tuitions could be kept low. In a number of states, policy was to keep tuitions at zero. However, in the late 1960's economists began to point out that such policies "wasted" scarce public resources because all students, not just the needy, were being aided. From a public financing perspective, it was argued that public resources should be expended only when a public good was achieved, not merely to transfer income from one group to another unless the latter group was needy. More simply put, it was held that public resources should not be transferred to those who could and would attend college even without public assistance.

This perspective, which led to passage of massive federal student aid programs, came gradually to be accepted as a basis for public policy across most, if not all, states. Political leaders of both liberal and conservative persuasions found elements of this policy with which they could identify. Liberals were persuaded by the argument that the money saved in reduced institutional support (albeit higher tuition) could be targeted on the poor, while conservatives considered it good public policy for students to pay more through tuition for the postsecondary education from which they benefitted.

Although it is beyond our purpose here to comment on these views, recent changes in tuition policies are of importance because in many states tuition income may be expended, with only routine constraints, as institutional leaders see fit. Thus, tuition revenue often may be the discretionary income that is applied to the special programs and students of interest here.

Community colleges' tuition and fee charges have been rising the fastest of any postsecondary sector. Between 1964 and 1977, public community college tuitions were up by 291 percent in comparison to 155 percent and 175 percent for public universities and other public four-year colleges, respectively.[70] Private institution tuitions were up more in dollar terms, but less in percentage terms. Although still relatively low because their 1964 base year tuitions were much lower, public community college tuitions now average $374.[71]

The analysis of higher tuitions as a funding mechanism for special purposes is mixed. With rising tuitions, community colleges capture more funds to target on underfinanced programs and (indirectly) students. Without these resources internal resource allocation would be much more constrained. On the other hand, the high tuition vehicle has not treated equitably the kinds of students who are our focus here. One of the problems is that adults are about twice as responsive to a postsecondary price as traditional college age youth.[72] Further, for students who must or desire to do non-credit remedial or other work, generally there is no direct state support. Exceptions may be noted in the case of administrative costs for these programs and for federally-supported programs; but the overall result is that non-credit courses and courses that tend to be taken by adults often must be "self-supporting", which means that the tuition charged must meet the full program cost. Thus, Pitchell found that 58.6 percent of all collegiate institutions and 66.9 percent of all public institutions charge part-time students higher tuitions than full-time students.[73]

The ultimate test of the higher tuition policies, however, lies in another direction. The keystone instrument of the new higher education financing strategy is student aid. Under this strategy, tuitions were to be raised so that institutional support could be reduced and the savings could be targeted on needy students. Thus, the question of real significance to our purpose here is whether student aid is getting to the students under study. As will be seen, some of the evidence is quite discouraging.

STUDENT AID

This section is a central one of this monograph. Recent changes in postsecondary financing policies have made direct student aid the primary strategy for expanding postsecondary access to new clienteles—the kind of students about whom we are writing.

After a short background statement, considered first in this section is the extent to which community college students overall receive an equitable share of aid; second whether the particular community college students under study here receive an equitable share; third what the obstacles are to an equitable distribution of aid to these students; and fourth whether student aid potentially can solve the financial needs of the community college students examined herein.

The parallel with the historical development of community college institutional support is striking. Student aid was developed in the late 60's and early 70's, when students were "young, single or recently married, without an established life-style, and willing to devote all of their personal, academic and financial resources to the pursuit of postsecondary education."[74] But like their institutions, community college students have changed. As shown earlier, community college students are relatively poorer, older, and more likely to have family responsibilities and be enrolled part-time than non-community college students. The focus of federal policy is on the first of these descriptors: ability to pay.

On a per capita basis, community colleges enroll far more needy students than any other sector of American postsecondary education. The median family income of first-time full-time freshmen at public two-year colleges is approximately $2,000 below the median for similar students in public four-year colleges and almost $6,000 below the median in public universities. In the private sector, median incomes are, of course, higher still. Further, whereas almost 30 percent of community college students come from families earning less than $10,000 per year, the percentages range from about 10 to 20 percent in public colleges and universities.[75] Finally, minority students who tend disproportionately to be needy are heavy enrollers in community colleges. Approximately 40 percent of minority full-time students and 91 percent of minority part-time students attend two-year institutions.[76] Thus, community colleges enroll 56 percent of all minority students.

The first issue regards whether community college students, on the whole, receive an equitable share of student aid. The evidence indicates that they do not. In 1972, the first year of the new Education Amendments, community colleges enrolled 30 percent of all full-time students but (their students) received only 19.4 percent of all federal aid awards and 25.3 percent of aid awards from any source.[77] Further, the amount of awards received clearly was smaller than in any other sector, as can be seen in Table 1.

Table 1. Distribution of 1972-73 Full-Time Freshmen Students, Student Financial Aid Recipients, and Average Amount of Student Aid in Dollars

Institutional Type	Distribution (percentage): Total Full-Time Students	From Any Source	Federal	Average Aid Amounts: From Any Source	Federal
Public Four-Year	43.3	42.7	41.6	960	921
Public Two-Year	27.7	23.1	17.2	636	733
Private Four-Year	21.7	26.8	33.7	1,703	1,400
Private Two-Year	2.3	2.2	2.2	1,007	876
Vocational	1.7	1.2	0.7	672	654
Other/Proprietary	3.3	3.9	4.5	1,664	1,639
	100.0	100.0	100.0		

Source: Base Year and First Follow-up Surveys of the National Longitudinal Study for the High School Class of 1972 (NCES 1975).

Most recent available data are no more favorable. Whereas community colleges enroll some 40 percent of all undergraduates and 55 percent of all freshmen (who receive considerably more aid than upper-classmen), their students receive only 36 percent of Basic Educational Opportunity Grants (BEOG) appropriations, 20 percent of Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants (SEOGs), 24 percent of College Work Study (CWS), 9 percent of National Direct Student Loans (NDSL's), and 8 percent of Guaranteed Student Loans (GSL's).[78]

Reporting on another year, Gladieux observed:

> The two-year colleges' relative participation in these "campus-based" (or institutionally administered) programs appears disproportionately low in view of the number of accredited two-year colleges (1,141), their share of post-secondary enrollments (over 25 percent of total full-time equivalent), and their heavy enrollment of students from low and moderate income families (approximately 53 percent of all first-time, full-time freshmen from families with incomes of less than $10,000).

Gladieux concluded that even after considering the lower costs of two-year college attendance, 20–25 percent of all student financial campus-based need for full-time students is in community colleges, whereas only 17 percent of SEOG's, 10 percent of NDSL's, and 21 percent of CWS so accrued.[79] Further, Gladieux estimated that 40 percent of BEOG funds should have accrued to community college students whereas 25 percent was the share realized.[80]

The most careful and up-to-date analysis generally is consistent with the above reports. Nelson, in a paper for the Brookings Institute, points out that over-awarding of student aid to community college students may in fact occur. Without drawing conclusions, she enumerates three potential causes: (1) "too-generous" standards for determining costs of attendance, (2) "too-generous" income exclusions of veteran's benefits in calculating expected family contributions, and (3) excessive aid in states where federal and state aid is uncoordinated.[81] Nevertheless, in spite of some possibility of over-awarding to community college students, Nelson concludes as follows:

> (1) There is no evidence that community college students are at a disadvantage in receiving basic grants compared to their counterparts at other institutions. (2) Campus-based funds have been distributed unfavorably to community colleges. (3) The distribution of campus-based aid worsened for community colleges between 1973–74 and 1976–77, while the distribution of BEOG monies improved.[82]

Thus, Nelson concludes overall "that current financial assistance programs meet a lower fraction of need for community college students than for those attending either senior public institutions or private colleges."[83]

In light of the above, Carlson's findings that the demand for public two-year college enrollment is more a function of tuition prices than of federal student aid is not surprising. This would appear to suggest that low tuition is more effective in providing community college access than student aid. Carlson's regression model predicted that public two-year college enrollments would decrease by roughly 4-¾ percent for every $100 tuition increase, whereas federal student aid was not a statistically significant predictor. Even more interesting, however, was the fact that the sign of the student aid coefficient was negative: As federal student aid went up enrollment demand in community colleges went down.[84] It would seem that federal student aid is not serving community college students particularly well. However, from other studies it is known that many students who receive aid merely migrate to more expensive institutions;[85] therefore, Carlson's findings must be interpreted with caution. It does seem quite certain, nevertheless, that the students of interest in this monograph are not among those who are able to attend more costly colleges and universities. Perhaps it would be more accurate to state that community colleges are not net gainers under student aid.

More to the point are the figures for the particular types of community college students being served by student aid programs. Of interest to our thesis, adult students are estimated to receive only 15 percent of federal student aid funds[86] even though only 51 percent of all students now are 18–24 year old dependents.[87] Similarly, part-time students account for only 3.8 percent of SEOG awards and 9.8 percent of BEOG awards,[88] though they are 41 percent of all postsecondary students.[89] Part-time students are entitled under the social security program. Such students compose 64 percent of the total community college student population but receive only 8 percent of federal student aid dollars.[90] Since award amounts are a function of portion of time in attendance, the share of dollars received by part-time students would be even less. In sum, less than one-fifth of adult postsecondary students receive student aid compared to almost half of traditional full-time students.[91]

The reasons for the under-representation of community college students, particularly adult and part-time students, are numerous and varied. Probably the greatest obstacle is the requirement that federal aid recipients be enrolled at least half-time or for 6 credits. Over 40 percent of all postsecondary students register for fewer than 6 credits.[92]

Another obstacle is that students must enroll in a program of at least 6 months or in some cases one year, leading to a degree or certificate, and admitting only those possessing the equivalent of a high school degree. Wagner estimates that altogether 14.5 million persons are so eliminated annually from federal student aid programs—about 20 percent of whom are enrolled in postsecondary institutions.[93] In New York, Purga estimates that the degree requirement alone eliminates over half of all adult learners enrolled in postsecondary institutions.

Other obstacles include award limits, needs analyses, and administrative procedures. Federal regulations require that students who qualify for a BEOG of less than $200 receive no award whatsoever—obviously to the detriment of part-time students attending low cost community colleges. Needs analyses are structured to respond to traditional full-time students and are dysfunctional for part-time and adult students, many of whom work and have family responsibilities. Even when income and assets are equal, needs analysis formulae discriminate against the nontraditional students.[94] Administrative procedures that work against part-time and adult students include the dissemination of information through high school counselors, a channel that is of little utility for adults; misinformation and misinterpretation of financial aid information provided to these non-mainstream students; the complexity of the application procedure for a relatively small financial benefit; low participation rates by the community colleges in the campus-based aid programs; and biases of institutional financial aid officers toward full-time students. Finally, and of special significance for community colleges, the TRIO program designed for students in need of remedial work serves very few youth beyond age 19 or enrolled part-time.

STATE STUDENT AID PROGRAMS

Generally, state student aid programs exclude part-time, and thus adult students, even more so than do federal programs although there are notable exceptions. At the state level, aid tends to be restricted to full-time study—a more confining policy than even the federal half-time restriction. Nevertheless, 16 state programs and the District of Columbia do permit half-time eligibility.[95] The most restrictive policy of all in terms of students affected is the restriction of student aid to costs of tuition and fees up to some maximum (20 states).[96]

Other state aid regulations affect adult and part-time community college students importantly. For example, 20 states and territories do not make partial awards, 11 state programs can be used only at private institutions (3 can be used only at public ones), and 5 exclude implicitly or explicitly community college students. Finally, all but 7 states use federal needs analysis methodologies that are alleged to be discriminatory against part-time and adult persons.[97]

State and federal student aid programs respond best to the needs and interests of low income, younger students who can attend full-time. However, they discriminate against older part-time students and middle income students. The discriminatory effect of student aid on older students has been addressed in some states by extending monetary awards programs to half-time students. While this policy change has resulted in more nontraditional students attending primarily public two- and four-year institutions, available data make it quite clear such students receive very little of the total funds appropriated. At best, for the limited segment of nontraditional students who are interested in degree work and who can afford to attend at least half-time, the monetary awards offset the tuition and fee increases that have been caused by the same public policy seeking to modify their undesirable effects.

For the part-time adult student individual subsidies are not effective for at least three reasons:

1. It is difficult to provide adequate information. The communication net for administering agencies relies to a considerable degree upon high schools which have no contact with adult students.
2. Procedures for determining need are based on the dependent 18–23 year age group and are less appropriate for adult learners.
3. Schedules of application are based on the typical cycles of full-time students which are inappropriate for part-time adult students.[98]

Community colleges historically have been low cost and committed to maintaining open access. The developments of the seventies have brought to these colleges a clientele that is increasingly more difficult and more expensive to service. Simultaneously, the decision to shift from institutional to individual assistance has fallen with particular weight on the community college.

The least expensive function of any postsecondary institution is to offer classroom instruction to well prepared lower division students seeking a baccalaureate degree in a non-technical or nonscientific field. The numbers of such students have diminished significantly in community colleges during the past five years. All evidence suggests this is a trend that is likely to continue through 1990 and more probably through the end of this century. If the community college is to have any opportunity of carrying out the mission it was originally assigned, let alone those that have evolved during the past decade, a fundamental reassessment of public policy must begin.

PART III
DIRECTIONS FOR THE FUTURE

Given a lower priority for postsecondary education among policy makers, increased competition for declining resources, reductions in the numbers of full-time students in most institutions in most states, and growing public concern about duplication, quality, and mission extension, what directions offer the greatest prospects for consolidating the community college gains of the past two decades? We offer the following suggestions as vehicles for stimulating discussion among professionals and those responsible for public policy:

Recommendation 1. The mission of the community college should be stated clearly in unambiguous terminology by defining the functions it performs in terms of the educational program.

As we have noted previously, discussion about what the community college is doing, or should be doing, is severely hampered by the ambiguous use of such terms as career education, continuing education and community service. Citing guidance or general education as functions confuses supporting services and curriculum concepts with programs that generate student credit hours of instruction. To make possible the public discussion suggested above, we propose the following functions whose evolution we have previously described.

- Academic Transfer—All credit instruction offered on a regular semester or term schedule as the equivalent of courses required for the first two years of a baccalaureate degree, provided the instruction is offered in the day or evening at an established campus.
- Vocational-Technical—All credit instruction offered as preparation or inservice development for a specific occupation or family of related occupations provided that the instruction is offered in the day or evening at an established campus on a regular semester, term or apprenticeship schedule (including supervised cooperative experiences).

- Continuing Education—All credit instruction applicable to a certificate or degree offered by the college where the instruction is offered at a location other than an established campus; or when the schedule is different from the regular semester, term apprenticeship or cooperative education format used by the college; or where the instructional delivery system departs significantly from the mode regularly employed.
- Remedial Education—All instruction designed to address deficiencies in literacy, numeracy or other learning skills with the intent of preparing students to undertake academic transfer or vocational-technical degree or certificate programs.
- Community Service—All non-credit programs or courses other than those offered specifically as part of a program of remedial education.
- Special Education—All programs or courses designed to provide basic literacy or occupational entry skills to persons characterized by one or more of the following conditions: functional illiteracy, developmental disability with or without physical trauma, lack of English-speaking ability, physical handicap with learning impairment.

It would, of course, be desirable for mission definitions to be standardized at the national level. Such standardization may be too ambitious as an initial step given the diversity among states. As an alternative, each state could develop its own definitions or terminology. We do believe that definitions will be useful to the extent they differentiate clearly between types of educational programs, delivery systems and clienteles.

Recommendation 2. If such approval has not been granted previously through explicit statutes, community colleges should seek legislative approval, through appropriate state level coordinating boards or organizations, for each of the missions defined in Recommendation 1.

The evolutionary nature of community college mission and the ambiguity of function definition has made it common practice for community colleges to offer to do anything they can fund. As a result, many community colleges offer some programs and services that have been legitimated only in the minds of administrators who "invented" the offerings, the clientele who participate, and national leaders who find expansions of mission consistent with the philosophy and missionary zeal of the moment.

Recognizing that the flexibility of the community college is a major strength, there are nevertheless consequences to the attempt to be "all things to all people." In continual mission expansion, faculty see threats to the quality of the academic transfer and vocational-technical functions in an era of declining resources, and their support of institutional mission becomes less than enthusiastic. When resources are scarce, legislators are particularly critical of offerings that appear social or recreational. Further, there is general public concern about providing K-12 education to the same people a second or third time and not all of the criticism is focused on the public schools.

Community college educators have not sought formal legislative approval for some of their programs and services for very good reason: such approval might be withheld, requiring terminating activities that attract new clientele and boost enrollments. A decision to expand functions without formal sanction may be defensible when resources are abundant. The same decision is questionable when limited resources must be spread across new programs and new clientele resulting in loss of overall quality.

We believe the risk of disapproval of one or more functions currently being carried out by some community colleges would be offset by the advantages of having official commitment to those functions approved. As competition for high school graduates intensifies, the risk of legislative disapproval of some functions is already evident. The Nebraska Legislature eliminated academic transfer from the approved mission of its two-year colleges. The advantage of seeking official approval involves building a better base of public support and ending or muting some of the rancorous and debilitating debate between administrators and full-time faculty, to name only two groups.

Recommendation 3. Community colleges should determine as accurately as possible the actual costs of the various programs and services they offer and the costs of programs they intend to offer. Some states, such as Illinois, already have this type of data for much of what is done.

Influenced by what one community college group has termed "the attitude that 'bigger is better' and that the academic health of an institution can be determined by examining its rate of growth,"[99] community college administrators have aggressively marketed new programs and services without examining the relationship between total costs and revenues generated. Where costs have been calculated, often they have been limited to the direct costs of instruction. Thus, administrators frequently describe continuing education or community services as "breaking even", even though marketing studies, advertising costs, postage, administrative overhead, and support services may not be considered in the analysis. The institution may in part be subsidizing mission expansion by reducing allocations to existing functions through borrowing from regular programs and by using large numbers of lower paid part-time faculty.

It is not our purpose, per se, to argue against seeking out new functions or financing expansion by using resources generated by existing functions. A particular social need may be so pressing as to justify any response an institution may be able to generate. We do maintain, however, that cost analysis is needed so that institutions constantly may monitor and be able to forecast the consequences for existing programs or undertaking the new programs.

We also recognize that some new programs or services may be profitable; however, we expect that accurate cost analysis would reduce the number of such programs from the numbers currently claimed and in the process enhance institutional credibility. Further, we believe there will be increased competition among institutions for the "profitable" programs.

Recommendation 4. Community colleges routinely should establish procedures for evaluating and reporting outcomes related to approved functions.

Again, this practice is already carried out to varying degrees in states having major community college operations. Reporting procedures vary, however, and seldom is the information provided in a consistent and usable form to state political leaders. In Arizona, such significant numbers of community college students transfer to the three state universities that the undergraduate student population probably resembles the inverted pyramid considered ideal where effective articulation between two- and four-year colleges exists. Yet, no comprehensive study of the performance of transfer students has been done and legislators complain about the absence of such data.

Even though comprehensive, valid measurable outcomes are difficult to obtain, the type of data that would satisfy legislators is not difficult to produce. Vocational-technical graduates can be surveyed to determine placement and salaries. Employers can be contacted for information about the competencies of graduates they hire. The persistence and achievement of transfer students easily can be evaluated. Students who enroll in remedial programs can be followed to assess their progress and performance.

Notwithstanding outstanding exceptions, most community colleges have resisted evaluation because of a philosophical commitment approaching religious fervor. Doubting the benefits of attending a community college was a heresy comparable to questioning the accuracy of the *Bible*. A study that raised doubt about the effectiveness of a program would have done more than expose a programmatic weakness. It would have raised doubts that could not have been tolerated among the faithful. In an era of stable or declining resources, however, it is essential that the results of expenditures of public funds be demonstrable.

Recommendation 5. Community colleges should seek modifications in funding formulas so that appropriations would reflect the actual costs of providing the services of approved functions.

A corollary to this recommendation is that community colleges should avoid performing services for which they do not receive adequate funding. The current practice of accepting all who apply regardless of the funding authorized conveys several messages to legislators, all of them undesirable. The first message is that quality is not an important concern of the community college. It is fairly clear from even an elementary understanding of economic principles that increasing services without increasing resources must mean a loss of quality. Either that or funding levels previously were excessive. Most observers of the postsecondary scene believe that quality rather than quantity will be the dominant concern of policy makers in the eighties.

A second undesirable message to legislators is that very little relationship exists between the amounts appropriated and the numbers of students served. Seemingly, regardless of appropriation levels, community colleges "accept all comers". In an era of scarce resources, increasing enrollments as a response to reduced appropriations provides an almost irresistable incentive to legislators to underfund community colleges.

The alternative is to seek approval for defined functions, to develop reasonable cost data and within the constraints of quality maintenance to provide the services possible given the resources available. Community colleges can remain true to their philosophical commitments by enrolling on a first-come, first-serve basis and by remaining open-door to the extent resources permit. Waiting lists are highly undesirable but they are already in use for high demand community college programs in the health sciences. A commitment to quality and the existence of waiting lists would carry to legislators a message much more desirable than the one currently being transmitted.

Recommendation 6. In providing basic literacy and occupational entry skills, community colleges should experiment with alternatives to the student credit hour format.

Essentially, this recommendation requires two actions, both of which have already been implemented in a number of community college settings. The first involves differentiating between those who have modest educational deficiencies correctable through a year or less of remedial assistance and those whose deficiencies make attainment of any postsecondary degree a highly unlikely prospect. The former can be served through existing community college programs. The latter group is the concern of this recommendation.

The best hope for the ability of community colleges to undertake the "sixth great mission" referred to earlier does not rest with the remedial approach in a credit-hour context where students must be financed by an assistance program designed around the needs of the baccalaureate candidate. Community colleges in urban areas under the influence of the Manpower Development Act of 1963 and its successor, the Comprehensive Employment Training Act of 1973 (CETA), have developed a more logical alternative in the form of the Skills Center which focuses on basic literacy training and the development of job entry skills.[100]

Skills Centers are distinctive kinds of organizations. Skills Center students attend seven or eight hours each day in training programs that are a year or less in length. Some Centers have open-entry and exit, and students progress at their own rate. Literacy skills are taught in conjunction with, and as needed for, job entry. Employers are closely involved in specifying required competencies, to the extent that some programs may be offered exclusively to meet the needs of a specific employer who guarantees jobs for those who complete the program successfully. State employment agencies provide input to the selection process and many programs have waiting lists. Those admitted are paid stipends and are expected to behave as they would in the job setting. Some Centers use highly sophisticated procedures for assessing the aptitudes of entering students including measures of manual dexterity and other non-verbal skills. Placement rates are high and the performance of graduates is closely monitored.

The roles of Skills Centers staff vary from those of traditional faculty. Academic credit is not awarded for the programs, so faculty can be selected without placing inappropriate emphasis on their academic credentials. Those who teach in Skills Centers have the same work schedules as the students; thus interaction is not limited by the 15 to 20 contact hour loads typical for academic and vocational-technical faculty in the community college. Faculty-union contracts do not cover Skills Center personnel so the costs of having faculty available to students for a 35 to 40 hour work week is not prohibitive. Students receive assignments and carry them out in the Skills Center setting, so the program does not require students to engage in independent, unsupervised study, an arrangement that seems ill-suited to their temperament and study habits.

Skills Centers are accustomed to developing programs quickly to respond to the changing demands of the job market. There are no curriculum committees or university articulation requirements to stretch out response times. Since virtually all funding comes from federal sources, the districts which operate Skills Centers exhibit little of the concern about coordinating these programs that is so evident in the operation of the traditional colleges.

Extension of the Skills Center concept to the comprehensive community college in order to respond to the charge of the Carnegie Council runs into one major obstacle. Because community colleges began as junior colleges, their frame of reference is the baccalaureate program. Such adaptive innovations as vocational-technical education and remedial services have been held in low esteem by academic faculty who still dominate the full-time professional staffs of most two-year colleges. Even board members and legislators assign low priority to out-of-school youth and to adults, complaining about paying for K-12 education twice. As a consequence, Skills Centers have operated in isolation from the traditional programs and with little, if any, support from local or state sources. There is little doubt that many boards would sacrifice Skills Center programs if federal funds were withdrawn. This would be in preference to making cutbacks in academic transfer or vocational-technical programs even where such programs or services are demonstrably overstaffed in relation to current demand.

Community colleges will have to face squarely the issue of whether this type of institute will be tolerated by academic faculty as well as whether the amount of bias and condescension that accompanies such tolerance will permit a healthy learning environment for trainees. The alternative is to develop special institutes outside the community college structure, an occurrence which may not be all bad. Proper considerations of effectiveness and cost could preclude serving, through a structure designed for the baccalaureate candidate, those who need basic literacy and occupational entry skills.

Recommendation 7. Community college funding strategies should be re-evaluated. Specifically, tuition charges, individual entitlement programs, institutional assistance, and the property tax as a means of preserving local responsiveness should be reviewed.

Since tuition is a fact of life in most community colleges, procedures for moderating its impact on students should be adopted by boards. Tuition waivers should be provided for needy students ineligible for other types of assistance. At the same time, the practice of providing tuition waivers automatically to those beyond a specified age probably should be terminated. As noted previously, studies indicate it is largely the more affluent senior citizen who takes advantage of continuing education or community services. Providing waivers to all who are needy but otherwise not entitled for aid would be more equitable than providing waivers to all seniors. Using a means test would also blunt current criticism about "free rides".

Community colleges should also study alternatives to the historic policy of charging a single tuition of all students. To the extent that subsidies continue to be channelled through students, it may prove desirable to adopt one or both of the following strategies:

a. Establish differential tuition charges for high cost, high demand programs enrolling primarily full-time students. Programs such as dental hygiene, nursing and radiological technology are likely to be over-subscribed even if current tuition charges are doubled or tripled. Since full-time students receive assistance based on the costs of the programs they attend, raising tuition charges would not eliminate needy students from such programs any more than it has eliminated them from private colleges.

b. Set tuition charges in general for full-time students at a sufficiently high level to create a surplus specifically earmarked for institutional assistance to students who cannot afford tuition and who do not qualify for assistance. This practice has long been followed by independent (private) institutions.

The preceding should not be interpreted as an endorsement of tuition in community colleges. As a matter of fact, this monograph discusses a number of undesirable consequences of tuition. However, given current public policy, community colleges need to discover creative ways of living with tuition.

Community colleges, in the interests of postsecondary unity, generally have supported at both state and national levels the growing emphasis on individual entitlements as the principal mechanism for ensuring access to higher education. We have serious doubts that the interests of the divergent community college clienteles are well served by these entitlements. In particular, we believe they discriminate against, for example, the part-time and independent students who form an ever larger part of the total enrollment of community colleges. As desirable as unity may be when approaches to the political leadership are made, we believe the advocacy of policies that may not be in the best interests of the majority of community college students should be avoided. Such advocacy may cause policy makers to conclude they have addressed the problems of community college students when actually they have made conditions worse.

As an alternative to extending individual entitlements to part-time students, a practice that may be inefficient and ineffective, we believe consideration should be given to a targeted tuition subsidy (TTS). Under the TTS, the state would reimburse community colleges for waivers granted to part-time students whose personal incomes fall below a certain level.

Recommendation 8. The development of residence halls should be considered where the specialized nature of programs offered and the geographic dispersion of clientele make commuting an expensive proposition.

The concept of a low cost, commuter institution located within driving distance of those it served was ideal for the days of cheap energy. In high density population areas with adequate public transportation, the commuting institution will continue as an economical alternative to residence halls for the full-time student population. As the costs of owning and operating an automobile continue to rise, however, residence halls may become an increasingly economical alternative to commuting.

Community colleges in the West and some technical institutes in the East have operated residence halls because some of their students came from distances that make commuting impossible. Since residence halls are operated as auxiliary enterprises with costs offset by revenues generated, there results no drain on tax dollars required for educational programs. Further, under the present system of individual entitlements, the possibly higher net costs to needy students are at least partially offset by higher entitlement awards. In fact, residence halls may reduce out-of-pocket expenses to the student as the costs of operating a personal automobile go higher and higher.

A principal reason that more two-year colleges have not developed residence halls is the opposition of four-year colleges and universities who fear competition in the coming decade of expected diminishing enrollments. From a practical point of view, in many cases there is much to recommend the alternative of taking courses out to the people. Unfortunately, outreach areas generally are limited to beginning courses where enrollments make the instruction economically feasible. Where laboratory experiences are required, as in the case of many vocational-technical programs, outreach areas cannot be served. Further, there are some two-year programs in which the capital investments are so heavy that a given state may be able to afford only one or two such programs.

For some community colleges in some states, the alternative to underused physical plants and students denied access because of transportation costs will be the construction of residence halls. We realize that this arrangement will be impossible in some states because of political realities. Still in some cases, the development of residence halls may become an important strategy for preserving access, especially to expensive technical programs that can be offered only in a very limited number of locations.

CONCLUSION

During the past seventy-five years, the mission of the community college has evolved to include an increasingly diverse clientele pursuing increasingly diverse objectives. Methods of financing community colleges have also evolved but have generally lagged behind the resource requirements resulting from the assumption of new functions. In the decade of the sixties community colleges became society's chosen instrument for achieving equal access. Increases in federal and state funds provided local taxpayers with services which could be bought for a dime, were worth a dollar, and appeared to be indispensable.

Changes in funding formulas to increase the dollars available for each full-time equivalent student combined with ever-increasing student enrollments created an environment of rising expectations. New institutions with new programs and services seemed to place the educational millennium within reach. Then, in 1972, without warning, enrollments in many community colleges declined. Concurrently, Congress ended the debate on institutional versus student funding by establishing a program of individual entitlements as the major national strategy for continuing the assault upon equal access begun by the open door community colleges.

From 1972 to the present, there has been a gradual erosion of the financial position of community colleges, with no concomitant adjustment of institutional aspirations. The result has been a period of educational inflation during which programs and services have been provided to greater numbers of students while the constant dollars available have often remained essentially stable or, in some instances, declined.

The problem has been aggravated by a decline in the numbers of full-time students accompanied by an overall increase in headcount. Formulas designed around full-time students gave inadequate consideration to the costs of serving the same full-time equivalency composed of large numbers of students who required most of the services but enrolled for only one or two courses each semester.

A growing number of states followed the direction of the Federal government by placing major emphasis on programs of individual assistance granted directly to the student. Such programs caused pressure for increased tuition with the heaviest impact, as measured by percentage of base, falling upon the community college. States with major programs of assistance to individual students invariably reduced the rate of growth of appropriations to public colleges and universities to force them to recover a greater percentage of their costs from student tuition. Since part-time students received a miniscule part of the total funds disbursed to individuals, community colleges found it difficult to recover higher percentages of their costs by raising student tuition without affecting adversely their total enrollment.

Community colleges have been among the hardest hit in terms of the adequacy of state appropriations. Those funded in part by local property taxes have encountered taxpayer resistance as the decline in the share of the costs paid by states had to be offset by increased local dollars. Part of the resistance has manifested itself as a tendency to question the importance of services and programs accepted without question when more of the bill was paid by the state.

To date, the emerging conflict between institutional aspirations for continuing mission development and the restraints imposed by financing arrangements designed to promote stability or even phased decline has not been confronted squarely. Community college leaders have avoided this confrontation by using increased numbers of part-time faculty, by avoiding the development of expensive programs and by heavy recruiting of part-time adult students into lower cost courses. It is not defensible to state that these adaptations have resulted in decreased quality since there were and are no generally accepted measures of quality and hence no sound basis for before and after comparisons. At the same time, it is fair to observe that the credibility of community college practices, aimed at continuing growth while resources dwindle, has become a serious issue both within and outside the ranks of community college educators.

As community colleges enter the eighties, we believe it essential to examine and discuss the relationship between institutional aspirations and available resources. To that end we have advanced a number of recommendations including:

- operational definition of the educational mission of community colleges;
- legislative approval of each defined mission on a state by state basis if this has not already occurred;
- accurate determination of costs by program;
- evaluation and reporting of outcomes in relation to approved functions;
- limiting programs and services to those for which adequate funding is provided;
- alternatives to the credit-hour, degree oriented format for providing basic literacy and occupational entry skills;

- examination of current funding strategies and revisions where appropriate;
- development of residence halls where specialized programs or geographic considerations justify.

The problem is clear and can be documented. The recommendations are speculative and are intended to stimulate discussion rather than to provide definitive answers. The community college concept has encompassed a dream of educational equality for all. Preventing a noble dream from becoming an impossible dream in the environment of the eighties will require the best efforts of policy makers and educators working together to reduce the widening gap between missions and resources.

FOOTNOTES

1. Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, *Giving Youth a Better Chance: Options for Education, Work and Service* (As quoted in *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, December 3, 1979), pp. 11, 13.
2. James F. Gollattscheck, et al., *College Leadership for Community Renewal* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976), p. 12.
3. Patricia A. Walsh, ed. *New Directions for Community Colleges, #27* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1979), p. 89.
4. Gollattscheck, et al., *Op. Cit.*, p. 12.
5. Carnegie Council, *Op. Cit.*, p. 13.
6. *Digest of Education Statistics 1977–78* (Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics, 1978), p. 126.
7. Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, *Three Thousand Futures: The Next 20 Years for Higher Education* (As quoted in *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, January 28, 1980), pp. 9–12.
8. Norman C. Harris and John F. Grede, *Career Education in Colleges* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977), p. 67.
9. James W. Thornton, Jr., *The Community Junior College*, 3rd ed. (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1972), p. 52.
10. Nelson B. Henry, ed. *The Public Junior College* (Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education, University of Chicago Press, 1956).
11. Garland G. Parker, *Collegiate Enrollments in American 2-Year Institutions, 1974–75: Statistics, Interpretations, and Trends*, ACT Special Report 14 (Iowa City: American College Testing Program, 1975).
12. Leland L. Medsker, *The Junior College: Progress and Prospect* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960), pp. 38, 64–68.
13. Charles R. Monroe, *Profile of the Community College* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972), p. 104.
14. John E. Roueche and Jerry J. Snow, *Overcoming Learning Problems* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977), pp. 39–40.
15. Robert B. Young, et al., *Directions for the Future: An Analysis of the Community Services Dimension of Community Colleges*

(Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1978), p. 11.

5. Monroe, *Op. Cit.*, p. 130.

7. Medsker, *Op. Cit.*, p. 19.

8. Leland L. Medsker and Dale Tillery, *Breaking the Access Barriers* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971), p. 19.

9. John Lombardi, *Riding the Wave of New Enrollments*, Topical Paper No. 50 (Los Angeles: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, 1975), pp. 2–3.

0. American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, *1979 Community, Junior, and Technical College Directory* (Washington, D.C.: AACJC, 1979), p. 2.

1. Ervin L. Harlacher, *The Community Dimension of the Community College* (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1969), p. 19.

2. American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, *1977 Community, Junior, and Technical College Directory* (Washington, D.C.: AACJC, 1977), pp. 2, 19–50.

3. American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, *1979 Community, Junior, and Technical College Directory* (Washington, D.C.: AACJC, 1979), p. 3.

4. James W. Reynolds, "Community Services," *The Public Junior College*, Nelson B. Henry, ed. (Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education, University of Chicago Press, 1956), pp. 140–160.

5. Monroe, *Op. Cit.*, p. 130.

6. Lombardi, *Op. Cit.*, p. 18.

7. Harris and Grede, *Op. Cit.*, pp. 303–304.

8. Solomon Arbeiter, "Evaluating Vouchers in WIN," *School Review* 86 (May 1978): pp. 499–503.

9. Gary Bridge, "Information Imperfections: The Achilles' Heel of Entitlement Plans," *School Review* 86 (May 1978): pp. 504–529.

0. John Augenblick, "Financing Community Colleges: An Examination of the State and Local Roles," *Issues in Postsecondary Education Finance: Summaries of Six Issues*, Report No. F78-2, William D. Hyde, Jr., ed. (Denver: Education Commission of the States, 1978), pp. 20–27.

31. Bridge, *Op. Cit.*, pp. 504–529.
32. Fred H. Harrington, *The Future of Adult Education* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977), p. 8.
33. Larry L. Leslie, "The Impact of Federal Need-Based Student Aid on Postsecondary Tuition" (Testimony before the Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, U.S. House of Representatives, May 9, 1979).
34. Lillian L. Glickman, et al., *Community Colleges Respond to Elders: A Sourcebook for Program Development* (Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, 1975), p. 1.
35. Paul E. Barton, "Lifelong Learning: Getting Started," *School Review* 86 (May 1978): pp. 311–326.
36. *Ibid.*, pp. 311–326.
37. Joann M. Steiger and Barbara Kimball, "Financial Aid for Lifelong Learning: The Special Case of Women," *School Review* 86 (May 1978): pp. 395–409.
38. Barton, *Op. Cit.*, pp. 311–326.
39. Walter I. Garms, *Financing Community Colleges* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1977), p. 2.
40. Jesse P. Bogue, *The Community College*, 1st ed. (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1950).
41. Garms, *Op. Cit.*, p. 11.
42. Leland L. Medsker, "Financing Public Junior College Operation," *The Public Junior College*, Nelson B. Henry, ed. (Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education, University of Chicago Press, 1956), p. 254.
43. Monroe, *Op. Cit.*, pp. 352–353.
44. Clyde E. Blocker, Robert H. Plummer and Richard C. Richardson, Jr., *The Two-Year College: A Social Synthesis* (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965), p. 282.
45. Monroe, *Op. Cit.*, pp. 356, 358.
46. Medsker and Tillery, *Op. Cit.*, p. 115.
47. Leland L. Medsker, "Financing Public Junior College Operation," *The Public Junior College*, Nelson B. Henry, ed. (Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education, University of Chicago Press, 1956), p. 257.

48. John Augenblick, *Issues in Financing Community Colleges* (Denver: Education Commission of the States, 1978), pp. 5–6.
49. David F. Armstrong, et al., *Funding to Fit the Mission of Community Colleges in the 1980's* (Unpublished paper of the Maryland Community College Research Group, 1979), p. 4.
50. Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr. "Alternative Missions for Higher Education in the 80's" (Testimony before the Committee on Labor and Resources, U.S. Senate, June 7, 1979), p. 8.
51. James L. Wattenbarger and William F. Stepp, *Financing Community Colleges, 1978* (Gainesville: Florida University, Institute of Higher Education, 1979). (NCES data are more complete but may be less valid).
52. Colorado has both District and State Community Colleges and is excluded from the calculations.
53. John Augenblick, *Issues in Financing Community Colleges* (Denver: Education Commission of the States, 1978), pp. 30–31.
54. John Lombardi, "Community College Financing in the Post-Proposition 13 Era," *Junior College Resource Review* (Los Angeles: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, 1979), p. 1.
55. John Augenblick, *Issues in Financing Community Colleges* (Denver: Education Commission of the States, 1978), Chapter II.
56. Wattenbarger and Stepp, *Op. Cit.*, pp. 2–5.
57. Aaron B. Wildavsky, *The Politics of the Budgetary Process*, 3rd ed. (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1979).
58. S. V. Martorana and Wayne D. Smutz, *State Legislation Affecting Community and Junior Colleges, 1978*, Report No. 33 (University Park: Pennsylvania State University, Center for the Study of Higher Education, 1979).
59. *Ibid.*, pp. 13–14.
60. *Ibid.*, p. 14.
61. *Ibid.*, p. 14.
62. *Ibid.*, p. 14.
63. *Ibid.*, p. 15.
64. *Ibid.*, p. 17.
65. *Ibid.*, p. 17.
66. *Ibid.*, p. 14.

67. *Ibid.,* p. 14.

68. *Ibid.,* p. 19.

69. S. V. Martorana and Wayne D. Smutz, "Twists and Turns of Legislative Intent," *Community and Junior College Journal* 50 (December-January 1979-1980): pp. 18–21.

70. Larry L. Leslie, *Higher Education Opportunity: A Decade of Progress,* Research Report No. 3 (Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1977), pp. 10–11.

71. Susan C. Nelson, *Community Colleges and Their Share of Student Financial Assistance* (Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institute, May 18, 1979), p. 34.

72. John Bishop and Jane Van Dyk, *Can Adults Be Hooked on College? Some Determinants of Adult College Attendance,* Mimeographed (New York: College Entrance Examination Board, January 1977).

73. Robert J. Pitchell, "Financing Part-Time Students," *Lifelong Learners—A New Clientele for Higher Education,* Dyckman W. Vermilye, ed. (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974), p. 44.

74. Robert Purga, *Financial Aid and the Adult Learner: Federal and New York Student Aid Programs,* Summary Report (Albany, New York: State Education Department, January 24, 1979), p. 14.

75. Jess H. Parrish, "Grant Programs in Title IV of the Higher Education Act" (Testimony before the Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, U.S. House of Representatives, May 22, 1979), Table 1. See also *School Enrollment—Social and Economic Characteristics of Students: October 1977,* Series P-20, No. 333 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1979), p. 58.

76. Parrish, *Op. Cit.,* p. 1.

77. Alban E. Reid, "The Carter Administration Proposal to Reauthorize Title III-Aid to Developing Institutions" (Testimony before the Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, U.S. House of Representatives, July 25, 1979), p. 2. *(The Digest of Education Statistics 1977-78,* Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics, p. 93, reports the data in a different fashion. NCES states that two-year public institutions enroll 19.9 percent of all minority students, compared to 14.2 percent for all other students, whereas two-year public institutions enroll 41.8 percent

of all students compared to 58.2 percent for all other institutions).

78. Parrish, *Op. Cit.,* p. 3.
79. Lawrence E. Gladieux, *Distribution of Federal Student Assistance: The Enigma of the Two-Year Colleges* (New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1975), p. 1.
80. Gladieux, *Op. Cit.,* pp. 16–17.
81. Nelson, *Op. Cit.,* pp. 9–18.
82. *Ibid.,* p. 28.
83. *Ibid.,* p. 33.
84. Daryl Carlson, "Table 5: Estimated Demand Function for Public Two-Year Institutions," Mimeographed (Tucson: University of Arizona, Center for the Study of Higher Education).
85. Larry L. Leslie, S. V. Martorana and Jonathan D. Fife, "Financing Post-Secondary Education Through Students: Windfall Profit or Recession for Community Colleges?" *Community College Review* 2 (March 1975): pp. 14–34.
86. Alan P. Wagner, "Financing Postsecondary Learning Opportunities through Existing Federal Student Aid Programs," *School Review* 86 (May 1978): pp. 412–435.
87. Parrish, *Op. Cit.,* Figure 1.
88. Wagner, *Op. Cit.,* p. 412.
89. Bette Everett Hamilton, "Adult Part-time Students and the Higher Education Act," *Change* 11 (May-June 1979): pp. 58–59.
90. *Ibid.,* pp. 58–59.
91. Alan P. Wagner and Kenneth A. Tabler, "Distribution and Packaging of Student Financial Aid: Some Evidence from the Survey of High School Class of 1972," *National Longitudinal Study* (Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1977).
92. Unpublished Tabulations (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1973).
93. Wagner, *Op. Cit.,* pp. 417–418.
94. See Purga for a detailed discussion of these problems.
95. Joseph D. Boyd, "State/Territory Funded Scholarship/Grant Programs to Undergraduate Students with Financial Need to Attend Public or Private Post-secondary Educational Institu-

tions" (Deerfield, Ill.: Illinois State Scholarship Commission. 11th Annual Survey of National Association of State Scholarship and Grant Programs, 1979-1980 Academic Year), p. 31.

96. Nelson, *Op. Cit.*, p. 31.

97. Boyd, *Op. Cit.*, pp. 35–44.

98. Richard W. Jonsen, "Lifelong Learning: State Policies" *School Review* 86 (May 1978): pp. 360–381.

99. Armstrong, et al., *Op. Cit.*, pp. 3–4.

100. Harris and Grede, *Op. Cit.*, p. 304.

ERIC/AACJC Monographs

*Junior College Institutional Research: The State of the Art.** By John E. Roueche and John R. Boggs. 1968. 70p. (ED 021 557)

*Personality Characteristics of College and University Faculty: Implications for the Community College.** By Florence B. Brawer. 1968. 104p. (ED 026 048)

*Institutional Administrator or Educational Leader? The Junior College President.** By Arthur M. Cohen and John E. Roueche. 1969. 55p. (ED 031 186)

*Student Activism in Junior Colleges: An Administrator's Views.** By John Lombardi. 1969. 83p. (ED 028 767)

*The Multi-Institution Junior College District.** By Frederick C. Kintzer, Arthur M. Jensen, and John S. Hansen. 1969. 66p. (ED 030 415)

*State Master Plans for Community Colleges.** By Allan S. Hurlburt. 1969. 55p. (ED 032 887)

*Student Characteristics: Personality and Dropout Propensity.** By Arthur M. Cohen and Florence B. Brawer. 1970. 69p. (ED 038 130)

*Orientation for Faculty in Junior Colleges.** By M. Frances Kelley and John Connolly. 1970. 85p. (ED 043 323)

*Values and the Generation Gap: Junior College Freshmen and Faculty.** By Florence B. Brawer. 1971. 77p. (ED 050 724)

*Black Studies in the Community College.** By John Lombardi. 1971. 75p. (ED 053 723)

*The Chief Student Personnel Administrator in the Public Two-Year College.** By Alice J. Thurston, Fredric B. Zook, Timothy Neher, and Joseph Ingraham. 1972. 75p. (ED 060 840)

*Community College Response to the High-Risk Student: A Critical Reappraisal.*** By William Moore, Jr. 1976. 60p. (ED 122 873)

*Time As the Variable, Achievement As the Constant: Competency-Based Instruction in the Community College.*** By John E. Roueche, Barton R. Herrscher, and George A. Baker III. 1976. 51p. (ED 122 872)

*Developing Constituency Programs in Community Colleges.*** By Max R. Raines. 1977. 70p. (ED 143 393)

*Dollars and Directives: Issues and Problems Related to Financial Support and Legal Authorizations of Community Colleges.*** By S. V. Martorana, James L. Wattenbarger, and Wayne D. Smutz. 60p. (ED 156 295)

*Perspective: Community Colleges in the 1980s.*** By Joseph P. Cosand. 63p. (ED 178 146)

The monographs with the single asterisk are $2.00 each and the ones with the double asterisks are $5.00 each from AACJC. Also, microfiche (MF) and paper reproductions (PC) of each are available from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service, P.O. Box 190, Arlington, VA 22210.